IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 12263 of 1994

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT S DAVE

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

LABSHANKER SHANTILAL NAYAK& 1

Versus

DISTRICT REGISTRAT & 1

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 12263 of 1994

MR RC JANI for Petitioner No. 1

MR RAJENDRA PATEL for Respondent No. 1

MR DG CHAUHAN for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT S DAVE

Date of decision: 20/10/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. In this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have challenged

the orders of termination of their services by the respondent No.2-Bank on various grounds.

2. Today, when the matter is called out for final hearing, the learned advocates appearing for both the parties have produced the order dated 6th June 2000 passed by the Labour Court, Ahmedabad, in Application No.404 of 1997 pursuant to the compromise purshis Exh.9 filed by the parties before the Labour Court. As per the compromise purshis dated 6th June 2000, which is signed by the parties in presence of the advocates for both the parties, the respondent No.2-Bank has paid about Rs.11 lakhs to the petitioners as a lumpsum amount towards full and final settlement of gratuity, leave pay and other such amounts on the condition that the petitioners should give up their claim of reinstatement. Copies of the order dated 6th June 2000 passed by the Labour Court and the compromise purshis filed by the parties in the Labour Court are ordered to be taken on record.

3. The learned advocates for the parties have submitted that, in view of the aforesaid the order dated 6th June 2000 passed by the Labour Court and the compromise purshis filed by the parties in the Labour Court, no further orders are required to be passed in the present writ petition.

4. In view of the aforesaid statement made by the learned advocates for both the parties, Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

(Anant S. Dave, J.)
(swamy)